UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

𝄞𝄞

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,576	03/11/2005	Northon Rodrigues	PU020393	7300

24498   7590   03/21/2007
JOSEPH J. LAKS, VICE PRESIDENT
THOMSON LICENSING LLC
PATENT OPERATIONS
PO BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER
HO, ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 March 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _3_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/11/2005_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 3/11/2005.

2. Claims 1-14 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim needs

to be ended with a period (.). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 4 and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

(i) said SNMP trap – line 1 claim 4.

(ii) said devices of said event group – lines 1-2 claim 6.

(iii) said device associated with said event – line 8 claim 8.

(iv) said association with said device and said event – line 9 claim

8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Angal U.S Patent No. 6,298,378 in view of Goodrich U.S Patent No.

6,516,326.

As to claim 1, Angal teaches a method for prescribing a device notified in

response to an event related to the operation of a data network (event listener being

notified when events occurred from other entities in the network wherein such events

include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 48-64 column

4) and said event comprising the steps of:

defining said event pertaining to said operation of a data network, wherein said

operation concerns the status of the data network or a device of said data network

(defining filters, wherein such filters describe the types of events that the event listeners

want to be notified of, types of events include changes in state of network devices, lines

20-29 column 2, lines 28-55 column 5, Fig. 4);

assigning at least one device of said data network to said event (event subscriber

is being associated with the filter, Fig. 4 and associated reading);

assigning a rule to said event, wherein said rule defines at least one condition for

triggering a notification of said event to said assigned device (rules of the filter, Fig. 4;

such rules defines conditional statements corresponding to events required by the event

listener, lines 42-55 column 5), and

said condition is to be activated when matched to a notification of the operation

of said data network (determination is made whether an occurred event matches the

filter, if matched then the event listener would be notified of the occurred event, lines 28-

55 column 5).

Angal teaches the system is implemented using a user interface, with the help

from a topology service, which allows a network administrator to maintain the network

devices including event communications among them (lines 4-30 column 4). However,

Angal does not explicitly teach the use of a topology editor. Goodrich teaches a

network system wherein network topology is implemented in a user interface, the

Network Topology Editor, which is used by a user to interact with network devices (lines

30-47 column 16). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference to include the

teachings of Goodrich reference because by using a topology editor, the system could

allow a user to use simple operations such as drag and drop to interact with network

devices as disclosed by Goodrich (lines 30-47 column 16).

As to claim 2, Angal as modified further teaches the topology editor in view of a

Simple Network Management Protocol compatible (specific protocol such as SNMP

events, lines 54-64 column 6).

As to claim 5, Angal as modified further teaches an event group is defined for

assigning a second device to said event (S1 is defined for event listeners L1 and L2,

Fig. 8A, lines 31-53 column 6). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for the reason of combining references relating to the use of a topology editor.

As to claim 6, Angal as modified further teaches the devices of said event group are notified with an action provider when said condition is matched to said notification (S1 forwards filtered events to event listeners L1 and L2, Fig. 8A, lines 31-53 column 6).

As to claim 7, Angal as modified further teaches the notification is rendered in view of a severity option (the severity of the event, lines 1-3 column 5).

As to claim 8, Angal teaches a method of notifying a device in response to an event related to the operation of a data network (event listener being notified when events occurred from other entities in the network wherein such events include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 48-64 column 4) comprising the steps of:

receiving a notification (receives the event, line 34 column 5) related to the operation of the data network, wherein said operation is related to a status of the data network or a device of the data network (events occurred from other entities in the network wherein such events include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 48-64 column 4);

comparing said notification to a condition of a rule (rules of the filter, Fig. 4; such rules defines conditional statements corresponding to events required by the event listener, lines 42-55 column 5);

notifying said device associated with said event with an action provider (determination is made whether an occurred event matches the filter, if matched then the event listener would be notified of the occurred event, lines 28-55 column 5).

Angal teaches the system is implemented using a user interface, with the help from a topology service, which allows a network administrator to maintain the network devices including event communications among them (lines 4-30 column 4). However, Angal does not explicitly teach the use of a topology editor. Goodrich teaches a network system wherein network topology is implemented in a user interface, the Network Topology Editor, which is used by a user to interact with network devices (lines 30-47 column 16). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference to include the teachings of Goodrich reference because by using a topology editor, the system could allow a user to use simple operations such as drag and drop to interact with network devices as disclosed by Goodrich (lines 30-47 column 16).

As to claims 9, and 11-12, they are methods claims of claims 2 and 5-6, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 5-6 above.

As to claim 13, Goodrich further teaches the topology editor operates with in view of consumer electronics enabled interoperability standard (systems with incompatible formats can be communicated with the others, lines 11-20 column 1). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for the reason of combining references relating to the use of a topology editor.

6. Claims 3-4, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Angal in view of Goodrich, and further in view of Vining U.S Patent

No. 7,152,075.

As to claim 3, Angal as modified further teaches transmitting SNMP trap in

response to an activated rule (SNMP trap daemon, line 56 column 5 to line 14 column

6). However, Angal does not teach a SNMP manager. Vining teaches a network event

notification system wherein a SNMP manager is used to transmit SNMP trap in

response to an activated rule (Fig. 1, lines 7-35 column 5). It would have been obvious

at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have

modified Angal reference as modified by Goodrich to include the teachings of Vining

reference because by using a SNMP manager, the event notification system could

further process SNMP trap as disclosed by Vining (lines 7-35 column 5).

As to claim 4, Angal as modified further teaches the SNMP trap is rendered in

accordance (transmitting SNMP trap daemon, line 56 column 5 to line 14 column 6).

As to claim 10, it is a method claim of claim 3. Therefore, it is rejected for the

same reasons as claim 3 above.

As to claim 14, Angal as modified further teaches controlling the operation of

said device in view of a second action provider (notifying filtered events to event

listeners, lines 31-53 column 6; sending request, controlling devices, lines 52-57 column

3). However, Angal does not teach controlling an action manager. Vining teaches a

network event notification system wherein an action manager such as a SNMP

manager is used to transmit SNMP trap in response to an activated rule (Fig. 1, lines 7-35 column 5). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference as modified by Goodrich to include the teachings of Vining reference because by using an action manager such as a SNMP manager, the event notification system could further process SNMP trap as disclosed by Vining (lines 7-35 column 5).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIM) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or' Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-

2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

A.H
March 12, 2007